

REMARKS

In the action mailed October 3, 2005, the Examiner examined claims 17-31, and, of those, rejected claims 17-31. Claims 17-31 are pending, of which claims 17, 22 and 27 are independent. Claims 17, 18, 22, 23, 27 and 28 have been amended. No new matter has been introduced. Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejected claims in view of the amendments to the claims and the arguments below.

Rejections of Claims 17-31

The Office Action rejected claims 17-31 as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,233,585 (Gupta).¹ Applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection because Gupta does not describe or suggest the subject matter of the independent claims 17, 22, and 27. For example, and as described more fully below, Gupta does not describe or suggest creating in a managing system an acknowledgement in the form of a partial rejection of the new entry or change, and transporting a data object containing the acknowledgement back to the managed system from which the new entry or change originated, as recited in the independent claims. Moreover, applicant's identification of the differences between applicant's claims and Gupta should not be taken as an admission that Gupta is properly considered prior art under any provision of 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Applicant's claim 17 recites a cross-system confirmation process including a plurality of database systems each having a dataset. One of the database systems is defined as a managing system for each data object that can be interchanged between the database systems. The other system or systems are each a managed system. A data object that contains a new entry or change from a managed system is transported to the managing system. An acknowledgement in the form of a partial rejection of the new entry or change is created in the managing system. A data object that contains the acknowledgement is transported back to the managed system from which the new entry or change originated.

¹ Applicant respectfully notes that the action in the explanation of the rejection refers to "Tan et al." Applicant understands the rejection and citations to be based on Gupta and has responded accordingly.

Gupta, in describing a flow control for processing a transaction, indicates a state verification service 225 on the server machine may check the state of each object involved in a subtransaction step and, to do so, “may utilize functionality in the APIs [of the client machine] to perform the checking functionality.” Gupta at col. 9, lines 32-36. Notably, Gupta discloses that a status of either success or failure is returned to the server machine. See Gupta at col. 9, lines 45-48. In addition, Gupta discloses the test performed (and to which the status of success or failure is returned) by the API is an “atomic test and set operation.” Gupta at col. 9, lines 45-48. As such, Gupta does not describe or suggest creating in the managing system an acknowledgement in the form of a partial rejection of the new entry or change, as recited in amended claim 17. Because Gupta does not describe or suggest creating the claimed acknowledgement, Gupta necessarily cannot describe or suggest transporting a data object containing the acknowledgement back to the managed system from which the new entry or change originated, as recited in amended claim 17.

Accordingly, for at least these reasons, applicant requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 and its dependent claims 18-21.

Claims 22 and 27 recite features similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 17, and do so in the context of a computer-readable storage medium (claim 22) and a system (claim 27). Accordingly, for the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 17, applicant requests withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 22 and 27, as well as claims 22-26 and 28-31, which depend from claims 22 and 27, respectively.

Applicant submits that dependent claims also recite patentably distinct features. For example, claim 18, which depends from independent claim 17, recites, *inter alia*, a database of the managed system logs a confirmation state of a changed data object using a counter section to display the confirmation state and a count of changes for which there is still no acknowledgement of a confirmation or partial or complete rejection of a change in the data record. Although Gupta discloses a form of transaction logging, using a transaction context to track state information and rolling back transactions (*see* Gupta at col. 9, lines 1-17, col. 11, lines 1-11 and FIG. 5), Gupta does not describe or suggest a counter reading that is increased with each change in a data record allocated to the counter section and is reduced with each acknowledgement, as recited in dependent claim 18. Further, although Gupta shows “a transaction counter 238” in FIG. 2, applicant cannot find, after careful reading, a description of,

or other reference to, a transaction counter in Gupta. The mere disclosure of a "transaction counter" does not describe or suggest a counter reading that is increased with each change in a data record allocated to the counter section and is reduced with each acknowledgement, as recited in dependent claim 18. For at least these additional reasons, application requests reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that pending claims 17-31 are in condition for allowance, and requests that the Examiner issue a notice of allowance.

It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Pursuant to 37 CFR §1.136, applicant hereby petitions that the period for response to the action dated October 3, 2005, be extended for three months to and including April 3, 2006.

The fee in the amount of \$1020 in payment of the extension fee is being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 9, 2006

Barbara A. Benoit
Barbara A. Benoit
Reg. No. 54,777

Customer No.: 32864
Fish & Richardson P.C.
1425 K Street, N.W., 11th Floor
Washington, DC 20005-3500
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (202) 783-2331
40305459.doc